DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 194 HE 000 142

By- Rohfleisch, Kramer

Some Limitations on Faculty Involvement in Academic Government.

American Association of Colleges and Universities, Washington, D.C.
Pub Date 11 Nov 68
Note- 10p.; Paper presented at the Eighth Annual Meeting of the American Association of State Colleges and Universities, Washington, D. C., Nov. 11, 1968
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$0.60
Descriptors- *Administration, Administrative Policy, Administrator Attitudes, College Administration, *Faculty, *Governance, *Higher Education, Policy, *State Universities
Identifiers- *California State College System

The standards faculty have set for their own participation in academic governance seem to apply to another less complicated world, for their involvement can definitely reach a point of diminishing returns--both to the individuals concerned and the educational process. In the California state university system, faculty government has developed to an advanced level although the cry of "all power to the faculty" is still heard. But if the faculty is heavily involved (often 10-15 hours a week) in the many facets of an extremely complex state administrative structure, who will teach (except perfunctorily) or do research? The results of overestimating the faculty's capacity for self-government are: waste of precious trained manpower, loss of talent as many faculty members completely abandon administrative responsibilities or become full-time administrators, emergence of the professional "politico," and, more important, further fragmentation of knowledge and the educational process since there is no general agreement within academic senates on the ends of education. The culture, graduate schools, and desire for professional status all nurture specialization. To preserve the faculty AS faculty, institutions should be jointly operated by faculty, students and administrators. And if administrators demonstrate respect for faculty views and participation, there is hope that faculty members will realize their limitations and concentrate on policy matters while administrators tend to the store. (JS)

ED025194

SOME LIMITATIONS ON FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN ACADEMIC GOVERNMENT

BY

KRAMER ROHFLEISCH

ED025194

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE000 143

SOME LIMITATIONS ON FACULTY INVOLVEMENT IN ACADEMIC GOVERNMENT

This hour, it seems plain to me, is a most appropriate one in which to extend greetings - and condolences - to all those who are now occupying the forward trenches in the academic battlefields. Precisely one half century ago, this day and this hour, a great conflict ended. Now we are engaged in another, one in which both you and I are involved, although it is your fate to occupy the more exposed foxholes in the field. Indeed, I can think of no other body of professional men and women who are so very vulnerable, who offer such temptingtargets to the barbs of our times, as do those who attempt to preside over the publicly supported institutions of higher education in this troubled land. There is here neither time nor necessity to list the problems; we may assume that you know them better than I. You are caught in a veritable cross-fire of pressures which greatly exceed, I should think, those felt by your colleagues in the private institutions. At least they are not forced to absorb the annual increments which threaten to overwhelm the public sector. They do not have to face hostile legislators and governors, although doubtless they do meet wavering donors and benefactors. But you must fend off simultaneously an aroused public, increasingly belligerent student bodies, disillusioned lesiglators and governing boards, and last but by no means least, a body of yeasty faculty people whose general deportment may at times bear only a faint resemblance to that of the men and women who once graced the profession in the more settled ages of the republic. In brief, yours is a difficult assignment and to some it may often appear sufficiently onerous to cause them to abandon it altogether. As a working member of one of these troublesome groups, I should like to offer a few observations relating to the role of the faculty.

May I state at the outset that despite the apparent sceptical tone expressed, I am in basic agreement with the ideals expressed to you by Dr. Davis, and that what I suggest here in no way stands in opposition to his views, for his views are those of the most mature of all the professional organizations, the AAUP, and these are my views. But I am forced to recognize that increasingly the standards we have set for ourselves regarding faculty involvement seem to fit some other kind of faculty than that which many of us see emerging, and perhaps some less complicated environment. Indeed, the very phrases in our several official pronouncements presuppose a devotion and commitment to our profession which now may not always seem apparent in all the many jurisdictions of public higher education. Perhaps our first word of caution, then, should be to observe some care in our use of the word "faculty." Do we mean those men and women, both the young and the mature, who are devoted to the task of opening minds, who are willing to tolerate and accept the onerous labor, the inadequacies, the disappointments, and the frustrations, all for the sake of their deeper commitment to the profession in all its many facets? Or do we refer to those academic birds of passage who come to us bearing with them a bright vision of some Nirvana which they mistakenly believed to exist in their well-endowed graduate schools and who now cannot easily face the realities of life in a tax supported institution forced to operate on shorter rations. I am sure we all are familiar with both types. Here I shall try to direct my references to the former group.

My first point is that faculty involvement in the business of administration, surely one of the historic goals of the AAUP, very definitely can reach a point of diminishing returns, not only to the individuals directly concerned, but to the entire educational process. Now this may sound slightly short of treasonable to my colleagues who yet labor in those Groves of Academe where faculty and

custodians are of equal value and equidistant from the administration. It may even sound objectionable to many who themselves are well advanced along the road to full faculty involvement. So be it. My task is to observe. But I am speaking from the vantage point of one who has long participated in a system which has a most advanced and highly sophisticated apparatus of faculty government, one that is politically alert, often adroit, conscious of its power, is surrounded and protected by the rules established by the AAUP, and very likely is as deeply involved in the details of administration as any group in the entire country. I might add that it certainly is gaining plenty of practice. By any national standards, the instruments of governance in most of the California State Colleges, and undoubtedly in all the larger ones, would rank at the very top level in the country, surpassing that of most universities. Admittedly, there remain a number of unfilled corners - elements of budget making, for example, but on most all of the major issues so long sought by AAUP, the battle is fairly won. Our colleagues in some of the less advanced areas often gaze upon us with wonderment. To be sure, not all of our people feel that we have moved either far or fast enough. Increasingly we hear in these troubled times the cry, "all power to the faculty", reminding those of us with an ear for history of a similar cry which arose during the Russian Revolution. But quite apart from the question of technological unemployment for the administration, it is apparent that even before we attain this high goal, some of us must ask the fateful question: what are we here for? If we do shoulder this burden, to excess, just who will tend the academic store, do the teaching, and extend the range of human knowledge? It is fairly obvious that precious few of any of these tasks will be performed by men sitting long hours

in deliberative bodies or in the numerous committees which are spawned like salmon roe. And in a complicated structure like that prevailing in a large state such as California, where there exist not only 19 separate units in one system, but two separate systems, each competing for public support, each with its own bureaucracy, the possibilities for consumption of faculty time and energies are practically unlimited. I strongly doubt that the residents of the ivied halls of the private campuses are even vaguely aware of the magnitude of the problems which daily confront both faculty and administrations in the burgeoning public colleges and universities which comprise the cutting edge of higher education. It seems to me that the guide lines for our operations have simply fallen in arrears, even those of AAUP. Perhaps they were designed, in some cases, for a different age, for different breeds. Faculty involvement at Pomona or Harvard means one thing; it means something quite different, both in degree and in kind, amid a great chain store system prevalent in a large state. Relations in the former may at times grow at bit testy, but generally they are localized. In the latter one finds echelon piled upon echelon, committee heaped upon committee to the extent that there are periods when the structure begins to remind one of a high school principal's effort to involve everyone in something-hence the pom pom corps.

Now I know of no serious literature on all this; perhaps it borders on heresy to bring it to light. But those of us who have lived through it all are aware of it, painfully aware, and some of our own surveys of faculty sentiment, employment of time, and similar matters, have revealed the astonishing expenditure of time which extensive faculty involvement can entail. One such study indicated that 10 to 15 hours per week was the price all too many paid

out. Now we may argue that the situation in California is unique. Perhaps it is, but doubtless there will be others that resemble it and their faculties will feel the weight of it. Department affairs will claim many hours, although much of the work at this level at least bears some relation to pedagogical and disciplinary interests. Upon these chores are piled Divisional responsibilities, often personnel matters, which are the most painful. Then there is the institutions's Senate, and above this, at least for a few,involvement in the statewide Academic Senate. Each level will call its meetings and hatch its multitude of committees, but this is not all. Each will produce its mass of position papers, agendas, and proposals, all of them requiring careful study by men of conscience up and down the line. And these agencies are surrounded by a variety of professional organizations, each with its own skein of committees. The result is predictable. Those who engage in these matters with enthusiasm soon discover that they cease to function as faculty members. They have become something else. Regardless of the size of their teaching loads they discover that they skimp in the classrooms and reduce their research to the vanishing point. Obviously Nobel Prizes are not won by steady attendance in committee meetings; neither are the frontiers of any field of knowledge shoved very far ahead. Teaching can become a perfunctory operation. These are but a few of the consequences of our failure to determine some boundaries to our zeal. But there are other consequences. One of them is the sheer wastage of precious trained manpower in petty tasks that might better be performed by professionals, or at least by men with no obligations to teach. We began with clear cut and legitimate demands for a role in the determination of policy. We end by seeking an increasingly tight control over the daily chores of institutional

housekeeping, and in watchdogging, all of which ruthlessly chew up our time.

There is another product of this wastage. In college after college there is developing a category of what I term "burnet-out cases", men and women who are torn between a desire to serve their academic community, on the one hand, and their intellectual and student constituencies on the other. They have learned that in our complex system they cannot simultaneously serve these two masters and sooner or later they drop out, withdraw from active combat in the political arena, and return to the more congenial tasks to which they originally dedicated their lives. A few others abandon the struggle from the other end and are siphoned off into full-time administrative posts. In either case there develops a kind of partial vacuum in the center which rapidly fills with people whose commitment to rational discussion and patient exploration of ways and means for betterment is often far less certain than that of those who have retreated. Indeed, there arises a fresh type, the professional academic politico, whose hours are spent not in expanding student minds but in twisting colleagues' arms.

There is another major area wherein we may have over-estimated our capacity for self-government. I refer here not to the wheels and bolts of the machine but to the direction in which the machine is moving. Certainly, it would seem, this is one area in which faculty judgment should reign very nearly supreme. In all our literature we seem to assume that rational, intelligent, and presumably highly educated men and women, left to their own devices, can look out upon this torn and tortured world and reach some agreement upon a common core of knowledge which might serve to draw all men together. But they do not, not unless goaded and badgered by some force outside their own body, by some agency or individual possessed of extraordinary leadership, powers of persuasion, courage, and perhaps even a touch of ruthlessness. Since these qualities are rarely

found in a single individual, and even if found, would rarely be employed, the result is that the residents of our public academic groves are almost incapable of producing anything resembling a rational educational structure designed to build thinking men and women. Instead, their senates and planning committees are far more likely to come up with solutions that further fracture knowledge and atomize learning. Their loyalties go to parochial departments which, under the exigencies of growth, eventually demand the fresh title of "schools", that is, units which seek to become miniature empires operating under their own legal codes and erecting entrance barriers designed to screen out all but those students sworn to their particular discipline. In short, our professional world operates in the shadow of a number of imperatives which drive it relentlessly in the direction of fractionation and segmentation. Who among us will stand and lay himself open to the missiles of his colleagues by stating that one discipline is more useful or more desireable than another? Indeed, how can this be determined when there is almost no agreement upon the ends of education itself? And without some such agreement on ends, it is futile to expect any agreement on means. What we actually find is that in order to maintain peace in the family, we practice a form of senatorial courtesy. All things, or very nearly all disciplines in the institutional cupboard, are regarded as of equal value. Concessions are silently and subtly traded, our objections are as silently swallowed, and the result is very often a grotesque educational patchwork. But is is ours. No administrator had forced it upon us. We would in fact deeply resent any who vigorously sought to prevent this form of anarchy. There would be a merry row and doubtless the AAUP ultimately would have to place the lot of us on the censured list.

Actually, however, it would be unfair to expect anything more of us,

because we are the products of a culture and of a Germanic educational system which is superbly geared for the production of trained specialists, but rather less well equipped and motivated to educate young men and women. Our graduate schools do not prepare us for the onerous and yet exciting work of opening semi-closed minds. I might add that our files carry letters from prospective candidates for our faculty who tell us that their senior professors have warned them away from us; we are a bad lot. We corrupt. We are noted for a vestigial desire to educate and in that vineyard there lies no professional future. To this factor add the demands of a pragmatic society, which supports this view; the result is that our culture, our graduate schools, and our desire for personal professional status all join hands to move our institutions in the direction of parochialism and specialization which snares the student at an early point in his career. Faculties in our large institutions are like those ancient Greek armies in battle which invariably shifted to the right as each man sought protection under his neighbor's shield. Left to our own devices, we shift to a fractionated educational structure.

Now what to do? Have I suggested that our proper course is to abandon a half century of AAUP tutelage and gratuitously hand every function back to the administration, while we return to those activities which originally attracted us to the life of the mind? I think not; it would be dangerous to do so. Instead, our first task is to recognize that there are definite limits upon faculty activity. The phrase "all power to the faculty" becomes a myth because power, once grasped, tends to destroy a faculty, qua faculty. If we accept the idea that our institutions of higher learning are best operated as joint enterprises, drawing upon the pooled resources of faculty, students, and administrators, then to preserve our role as scholars we may be forced to

confine ourselves fairly closely to the business of establishing institutional policy and those matter of demonstrably intimate concern to the faculty. I have no fears that there will be any shortage of employment.

But there is also an obligation upon the administration. It will have to give evidence that it can recognize an educated man when it sees one, that it knows how one is produced, that it can distirguish between an education and a training, and that is has the courage and political expertise to entice its faculty to follow such a path. Further, it must demonstrate a willingness and capacity to defend the academic testing grounds against the enormously expanded pressures now building to transform them into docile instruments of the world that is, not the one that might be. And it must demonstate that is respects the faculty's deep interest in shaping the environment and conditions in which its spends its professional life. If it does all these things, I think that there is some hope that eventually faculties will realize their limitations and concentrate on matter of policy, while the administrators tend to the store. But should the administration fail in these goals, then I do believe that we will face a long period of accelerated political skirmishing for power in many of our institutions, skirmishing which can bring few benefits to us, to the student, or to the republic of learning.